Is GRO J1744-28 a Strange Star?

K.S. Cheng[*,1], Z.G. Dai[2], D.M. Wei[3], and T. Lu[2,4]

[1]*Department of Physics, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China*

[2]*Department of Astronomy, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China* [3]*Purple Mountain Observatory, Nanjing 210008, China*

[4]*CCAST (World Laboratory), P.O. Box 8730, Beijing 100080, China*

[*]*To whom correspondence should be addressed*

arXiv:astro-ph/9806024v1 2 Jun 1998

Abstract

The unusal hard x-ray burster GRO J1744-28 recently discovered by the Compton Gamma-ray Observatory (GRO) can be modeled as a strange star with a dipolar magnetic field $\leq 10^{11}$ Gauss. When the accreted mass of the star exceeds some critical mass, its crust may break, resulting in conversion of the accreted matter into strange matter and release of energy. Subsequently, a fireball may form and expand relativistically outward. The expanding fireball may interact with the surrounding interstellar medium, causing its kinetic energy to be radiated in shock waves, producing a burst of x-ray radiation. The burst energy, duration, interval and spectrum derived from such a model are consistent with the observations of GRO J1744-28.

PACS numbers: 97.80.Jp; 13.38Mh; 95.30Gv; 97.60Gb

GRO J1744-28 is a new type of x-ray transient source, which was discovered on 2 December 1995 by the Burst And Transient Source Experiment (BATSE) on the *Compton Gamma-Ray Observatory* (*1*). The bursts were detected up to energies of $\sim 75\,\mathrm{keV}$ with intervals between bursts of about 200 s initially. After 2 days the burst rate dropped to about one per hour (*2*). However, by 15 January 1996 the burst rate had increased to ~ 40 per day. The burst durations lasted $\sim 10\,\mathrm{s}$. The burst fluences (25-60 keV) range between 1.7×10^{-7} and $6.8 \times 10^{-7}\,\mathrm{erg\,cm^{-2}}$; the average fluence $\bar{S} = (2.7 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-7}\,\mathrm{erg\,cm^{-2}}$. The position of the source is at the Galactic Center. For a distance of $\sim 7.5\,\mathrm{kpc}$, the

average peak luminosity was $\sim 2 \times 10^{38}\,\mathrm{erg\,s^{-1}}$. Analysis of the BATSE data indicated that the source is a binary pulsar with a pulsation period of 0.467 s, a companion of mass between 0.22–1.0 $M_\odot$, and a binary orbital period of 11.8 days (*3*). Because the x-ray mass function is small ($\sim 1.31 \times 10^{-4} M_\odot$), the system must be nearly face-on to an observer from Earth with an inclination angle of $\sim 18^\mathrm{o}$ (*3-5*). Furthermore, in order for the measured rotation period derivative to be consistent with the standard accretion torque theory (*6*), the persistent luminosity of the source at its peak should be close to the Eddington limit (*4*) and the surface dipole magnetic field of the pulsar should be $\leq 10^{11}$ G (*3-5*). ¿From the observed pulsed fraction and pulsar's x-ray spectrum, the strength of the local surface magnetic field is estimated to be several 10^{12} G(*4*). In addition, the proportional counter array (PCA) experiment (2-60 keV) on the *Rossi X-ray Timing Explorer* (*RXTE*) (*7*) had detected GRO J1744-28 in the period 18 January –10 May 1996. The observations showed that following the earlier large bursts the flux dipped below the preburst level by up to 25%–30% and then made a slow quasi-exponential recovery back toward the preburst level. The observed recovery period lasted up to $\sim$ 1000 s for some bursts, but most bursts recovered in a few hundred seconds.

The properties of the hard x-ray bursts (HXRBs) from GRO J1744-28 differ from those of other known high-energy bursts — x-ray bursts, soft γ-ray bursts and γ-ray bursts. First, the HXRBs are probably not type-I x-ray bursts (*8*). Thus, thermonuclear flashes in matter accreted onto the surface of a neutron star may not produce HXRBs. Second, the durations of the HXRBs are several hundred longer times than those of the three soft γ-ray repeaters even though these two kinds have similar repeat times and spectra. Third, the HXRBs are different from γ-ray bursts, because γ-ray bursts do not have fast repeat times and their spectra are much harder. On the other hand, the repeat times and spectra of the HXRBs are somewhat similar to those of type-II x-ray bursts from the Rapid Burster (*2,8*). This suggests that some accretion instability may be a mechanism for producing HXRBs. Very recently Cannizzo (*9*) studied the global, time-dependent evolution of the Lightman-Eardley instability, which might account for some observational features of the HXRBs. Here we propose an alternative model, in which a strange star accretes matter

from its low-mass companion.

Strange matter, which is bulk quark matter, was conjectured to be more stable than hadronic matter (*10*). Studies showed that the existence of strange matter is allowable within uncertainties inherent in a strong-interaction calculation (*11*). Thus, strange stars may exist in the Universe. Strange stars only have crusts with masses $\sim 10^{-5} M_\odot$(*12*). However, the postglitch behavior of pulsars can be described by the neutron-superfluid vortex creep theory (*13*) which requires the crustal mass $\geq 10^{-3} M_\odot$. The conversion of a neutron star to a strange star may require the formation of a strange-matter seed, which is produced through the deconfinement of neutron matter at a density $\sim$7–9ρ_0 (where ρ_0 is the nuclear matter density), much larger than the central density of a $1.4 M_\odot$ neutron star with a moderately stiff to stiff equation of state (*14*). These two features suggest that strange stars may be formed in low-mass x-ray binaries (*15*) because when the neutron star in a low-mass x-ray binary accretes sufficient mass (perhaps $\geq 0.4 M_\odot$) its central density can reach the deconfinement density and subsequently the whole star will undergo a phase transition to become a strange star. The phase transition from nuclear matter to strange matter under the condition of conserved charge rather than constant pressure may occur at a density as low as 2–3ρ_0(*16*). If so, strange stars may be formed during the evolution of protoneutron stars (*17*). Here we would remind the reader of some arguments against the existence of strange stars. For example, the disruption of a single strange star may contaminate the entire galaxy and essentially all neutron stars may be strange stars (*18*). In view of these uncertainties, we should only regard strange stars as possible stellar objects.

According to the standard accretion torque theory (*6*)and Daumerie et al. (*4*) the binary system of GRO J1744-28 is nearing the end of the mass transfer phase. If this is true then the companion has transferred mass of $\geq 0.4 M_\odot$ to the pulsar and now has a mass $\sim$ 0.22–0.5$M_\odot$. From the scenario proposed in (*15*) and the above discussion, we suggest that the pulsar in GRO J1744-28 is a strange star.

We next discuss the burst mechanism. We assume that far from the proposed strange

star the magnetic field is purely dipolar, and the accretion flow is spherically symmetric. We consider a simple case: $M_{\rm pulsar} = 1.8 M_\odot$ and $R_{\rm pulsar} = 10^6\,$cm. The Alfvén radius for spherical accretion, obtained by balancing accretion and magnetic pressure, is given by $R_A = 1.8 \times 10^7 L_*^{-2/7} B_*^{4/7}$ cm, where L_* is the total accretion luminosity of $\sim 2 \times 10^{38}\,{\rm ergs\,s^{-1}}$ (the Eddington limit), and B_* is the surface dipolar magnetic field strength in units of $2 \times 10^{10}\,$G which is close to the B_* derived in (*5*). For an assumed dipolar magnetic field geometry, $\sin^2\theta_m/r = $ constant, where θ_m is the magnetic colatitude. Thus, at the stellar surface near a pole, the cross-sectional area of the accretion column is about $A_p \approx 1.8 \times 10^{11} L_*^{2/7} B_*^{-4/7}$ cm^2, and the corresponding radius of the accretion column is $r_p \approx 2.4 \times 10^5 L_*^{1/7} B_*^{-2/7}$ cm.

As the strange star accretes matter from its companion, strong pressure is formed at the base of the accreted matter near the polar cap, due to the gravitational attraction of the compact strange star. When this pressure exceeds the critical stress of the star's thin crust, the crust may break. Therefore, the condition under which a crust-breaking event takes place should be given by $\rho h g = \mu\theta$, where ρ is the density at the base of the accreted matter, h is the height of the accretion column, g is the surface gravity, μ is the shear modulus, and θ is the shear angle of the crust. θ should be about 10^{-3} for neutron stars in low-mass x-ray binaries to explain the bimodal magnetic field distribution of binary pulsars(*19*). We expect that θ for strange stars in low-mass x-ray binaries is close to this value because the stellar crust in both cases are replaced by accretion material. From (*20*), $\mu \approx 2.5 \times 10^{27}$ dyn cm^{-2}, so we obtain the column density of the accreted matter, $\sigma = \rho h \approx 1.0 \times 10^{10} \theta_{-3}$ g cm^{-2}, where $\theta_{-3} = \theta/10^{-3}$. The interval between crust-breaking events can be written as

$$\tau_1 \approx \frac{\sigma A_p}{\dot{M}} \approx 2.2 \times 10^3 \theta_{-3} L_*^{-5/7} B_*^{-4/7} \ {\rm s}\,. \tag{1}$$

As the luminosity due to accretion decreases or the magnetic field decays, τ_1 increases. This time scale is consistent with the typical, observed intervals between the HXRBs. However, the accreted matter may diffuse away from the polar cap area A_p before it builds up enough pressure to break the crust. We now estimate the diffusion time of the

accreted matter across the local magnetic field of the polar cap B_s, which is assumed to be dominated by the multipole field component and in general much stronger than that of the dipolar field component. The transverse velocity resulting from collisional diffusion in the presence of a pressure gradient (∇P) is approximated by $v_d \sim 1.3 \times 10^2 Z T_8^{-3/2} B_s^{-2} \nabla P \ \mathrm{cm\,s^{-1}}$ (*21*) where $Z = 1$ for hydrogen, T_8 is the matter temperature in units of $10^8\,\mathrm{K}$ and B_s is the local surface magnetic field. In the present case, $\nabla P \sim \mu\theta/r_p$. So the diffusion velocity $v_d \sim 2 \times 10^{-4} T_8^{-3/2} L_*^{-1/7} B_*^{2/7} (B_s/10^{12}G)^{-2} \ \mathrm{cm\,s^{-1}}$. Thus, the time scale for the accreted matter to diffuse over the length $\sim 1\,\mathrm{km}$ is at least $10^9\,\mathrm{s}$, which is much longer than τ_1.

After the crust has been broken, the accreted matter will fall into the strange-matter core in a time $\sim 1\,\mathrm{ms}$. Subsequently releasing two kinds of energy: (i) gravitational energy $\sim 2\,\mathrm{MeV}$ per nucleon, which is due to the movement of the accreted matter from the stellar surface to the base of the crust and (ii) deconfinement energy $\sim 30\,\mathrm{MeV}$ per nucleon, due to the conversion of the accreted matter to more stable strange matter (*22*). The total released energy is $E_{\rm tot} \sim 5.5 \times 10^{40} \theta_{-3} L_*^{2/7} B_*^{-4/7}$ ergs. Because the total volume of the strange-matter blobs formed during the conversion of accreted matter is rather small ($\sim 10^6\,\mathrm{cm}^3$), most of $E_{\rm tot}$ will be radiated through photons from the surfaces of the blobs. However, a fraction of the radiation energy may be absorbed and then reradiated as neutrinos which pass almost freely through the crust. Thus, it is expected that about half of the total released energy may be finally radiated in photons which form a fireball of volume $\sim A_p l$ (where l is close to the crustal thickness $\sim 10^4\,\mathrm{cm}$). Assuming that ξ is the ratio of the fireball energy to the total released energy, we obtain the fireball energy

$$E_\gamma \sim 2.8 \times 10^{40} \xi_{1/2} \theta_{-3} L_*^{2/7} B_*^{-4/7} \ \mathrm{ergs}\,, \tag{2}$$

where $\xi_{1/2} = 2\xi$. Let T_0 be the initial temperature of the fireball. By using the expression $\frac{11}{4} a T_0^4 A_p l \sim E_\gamma$, we have $T_0 \sim 5.2 \times 10^9 \xi_{1/2}^{1/4} \theta_{-3}^{1/4}$ K. The fireball must be contaminated by baryons and we can estimate the amount of contamination. The radiation-dominated outflow begins when the radiation energy density $u_\gamma = \frac{11}{4} a T_0^4$ is equal to the gravitational energy density $u_g = GM\rho/r$, or $\rho = 8.7 \times 10^5 (T_0/10^{10}\,\mathrm{K})^4 \ \mathrm{g\,cm^{-3}}$.

¿From (*23*), the column density for the radiation-dominated surface layer is given by $\sigma' \approx 3\times 10^8\,\mu_e^{-1/3}(\rho/10^6\,\mathrm{g\,cm^{-3}})^{4/3}\ \mathrm{g\,cm^{-2}}$, where μ_e is the mean molecular weight per electron ($\mu_e = 1$ for hydrogen). Therefore, the amount of the baryons loaded with the fireball is approximated by $\Delta M \approx \sigma' A_p \sim 1.4\times 10^{18}\xi_{1/2}^{4/3}\theta_{-3}^{4/3}L_*^{2/7}B_*^{-4/7}$ g. Thus, the ratio of the initial fireball energy to the rest energy of the contaminating baryons is defined as $\eta \equiv \frac{E_\gamma}{\Delta M c^2} \sim 21\xi_{1/2}^{-1/3}\theta_{-3}^{-1/3}$. The fireball will expand outward because of the large optical depth of photon-electron scattering. Because $\Delta M/M_\odot > 1.7\times 10^{-16}(E_\gamma/10^{41}\,\mathrm{ergs})$(*24*), most of the initial fireball energy will be converted into the bulk kinetic energy of the baryons during the expansion. When the optical depth becomes one, therefore, the rest radiation energy becomes negligibly small. Fortunately, as suggested by Mészáros and Rees (*25*), the expanding shell (having a relativistic factor $\Gamma \sim \eta$) will interact with the surrounding medium and its kinetic energy will be converted into the random energy of the shell by shock waves and finally radiated through nonthermal processes in these shock waves. The timescale for radiation is approximated by (*25*)

$$\tau_2 \approx 0.1E_{\gamma,40}^{1/3}(\Gamma/10^2)^{-8/3}n_0^{-1/3}\ \mathrm{s} \sim 9.0\xi_{1/2}^{11/9}\theta_{-3}^{11/9}L_*^{2/21}B_*^{-4/21}n_0^{-1/3}\ \mathrm{s}\,, \tag{3}$$

where n_0 is the interstellar density ($\sim 1\,\mathrm{cm^{-3}}$). This time scale is consistent with the typical, observed durations of the HXRBs.

It is widely believed that electrons can be accelerated by shock waves to very high energy with the minimum Lorentz factor $\gamma_{\min} \sim (m_p/m_e)\Gamma$, assuming that all particles behind the shock waves have the same energy. If the shock waves can produce approximate equipartition between the magnetic field energy density and the particle energy density, then the strength of magnetic field is about $B \simeq 0.3\Gamma n_0^{1/2}$ G(*25*). The typical synchrotron photon energy emitted by electrons with the Lorentz factor $\gamma_{\min}$ at the observer's frame is about

$$\epsilon_p \simeq 1\xi_{1/2}^{-4/3}\theta_{-3}^{-4/3}n_0^{1/2}\ \mathrm{KeV}\,. \tag{4}$$

It is usually expected that diffusion shock wave acceleration can produce a power-law electron spectrum, $dN_e/d\gamma \sim \gamma^{-p}$, $\gamma_{\min} \le \gamma \le \gamma_{\max}$, where the spectral index p is typically

between 2 and 3 (*26*). The synchrotron radiation for electrons with such a distribution has a spectrum for photon energies larger than ϵ_p with a power-law form with the photon index of $\alpha = -(p+1)/2$(*27*). So the theoretical value of α may be from about -1.5 to -2.0. This result is consistent with the observations by OSSE, $\alpha = -(2.0 \pm 0.6)$ (*28*), and the observations by *RXTE*, $\alpha \sim -1.3$ (*7*). The bursting spectrum for our radiation model is similar to the spectrum of the persistent emission observed in (*7,28*). Theoretically the radiation processes at the surface near a magnetic pole of the accreting strange star are complicated, and to study these processes is beyond the scope of our paper. Some models studying the radiation processes of an accreting neutron star with a rather strong magnetic field may give power-law spectra with an index near -1.5(*29*). In addition, it should also be noted that the spectrum does not evolve during the bursting period because the spectral index for the electron distribution behind the shock wave during the shell's expansion is unlikely to be changed (*30*).

We can estimate the recovery time scale as follows. When a burst occurs, the huge radiation pressure will push the accretion matter outward over a distance $\Delta r \sim \frac{E_\gamma R_A v_r}{L R_{\rm pulsar}}$, where L is the accretion luminosity and v_r is the radial velocity of the accreted matter. After a burst, the accretion matter will fall back toward the strange star over a time

$$\tau_3 \sim \frac{\Delta r}{v_r} \sim 2.4 \times 10^3 \xi_{1/2} \theta_{-3} L_*^{-1}\ {\rm s}\,. \quad (5)$$

which is consistent with the typical, observed recovery time scale(*7*).

We can compare other characteristics determined from eqs. (1), (2) and (3) with the observations. First, the *RXTE* observations on GRO J1744-28 between 29 January and 26 April, 1996 indicate (*7*) that the data of the nonbursting flux from this source can be approximately fitted with the straight line flux (mcrab) = $2703.3 - 23.0D$, where D is the day number in 1996. If this expression can be extrapolated to December 1995, the ratio of the persistent flux on 5 December 1995 to the persistent flux on 30 January 1996 is about 1.6. Because the interval time scale is proportional to $L_*^{-5/7}$(eq.1), the ratio of the typical interval time scales for the HXRBs on 30 January 1996 to that on 5 December 1995 is about 1.4. The observations from *RXTE* on 30 January 1996 (*7*) and BATSE on

5 December 1995 (*2*) showed this ratio is ~ 1.38. Therefore, eq.(1) is consistent with the observations. Second, for our model, the bursting flux is obtained by dividing eq. (2) by eq. (3), and this flux is proportional to $L_*^{4/21}$. This means that the bursting flux is weakly dependent upon the persistent flux in agreement with the observations from BATSE (*2,8*) and OSSE (*28*).

The surface radiation in the crust-breaking region during the bursts should show pulsations amplitude close to that of pulsations during the nonbursting periods. This model implication agrees with the observations from OSSE (*28*) and *RXTE* (*31*). However, the reults of RXTE indicates that the bursting flux seems approximately linearly proportional to the persistent flux(*32*). The more detail discussion on the discrepancies between experimental results and model predictions is presented elsewhere(*33*). According to accretion instability models, on the other hand, during the accretion instability, a great deal of matter falls onto the surface near a magnetic pole of the pulsar, and subsequently a great number of gravitational energies are released and an HXRB is thus formed. Following this picture, one should detect pulsations during the bursts amplitude of which is much larger than that of pulsations during the nonbursting periods.

Finally, we want to remark that a similar strange star model is recently proposed to explain the soft γ-ray repeaters(*34*). The key differences between these two models are (i)the crust cracking of the soft γ-ray repeater model results from the spin-down of the strange star instead of accretion, (ii)the amount of energy released from these two mechanisms differ by two order of magnitude and (iii)the strength of the dipolar magnetic field in these two kind of sources also differ by two order of magnitude. (iv)The time scales of energy release are difference by at least one order of magnitude. These differences make the magnetic energy density of the soft γ-ray repeaters stronger than the radiation energy density therefore the fireball mechanism cannot be developed.

References and Notes

1. G. Fishman *et al.*, IAU Circ. No. **6272** (1995).
2. C. Kouveliotou *et al.*, Nature (London) **379**, 799 (1996).

3. M.H. Finger *et al.*, Nature (London) **381**, 291 (1996).

4. P. Daumerie, V. Kalogera, F.K. Lamb and D. Psaltis, Nature (London) **382**, 141 (1996).

5. S.J. Sturner and C.D. Dermer, Astrophys. J. **465**, L31 (1996).

6. P. Ghosh and F.K. Lamb, Astrophys. J. **234**, 296 (1979).

7. A.B. Giles *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **469**, L25 (1996).

8. X-ray bursts are sudden increases in the x-ray flux of x-ray sources, with rise times of $\leq$ 1s, and subsequent decay with characteristic times ranging from 10s to a few minutes. They are classified into two classes: type-I and type-II X-ray bursts. Type-I X-ray bursts are characterized by the relatively long burst intervals (hours to days) and the significant spectral softening during the burst decay as compared to their type-II conterparts. The differences between type-I(II) bursts and the HXRBs is discussed by W.H.G. Lewin, R.E. Rutledge, J.M. Kommers, J. van Paradijs and C. Kouveliotou, Astrophys. J. **462**, L39 (1996).

9. J.K. Cannizzo, Astrophys. J. **466**, L31 (1996).

10. Pure hadronic matter can exist inside compact stars, for example neutron stars in which most stellar masses are in the form of free protons and neutrons. In extremely high density, the smaller constituents (quarks) inside the protons and neutrons are no longer confined and a new phase of matter can occur. It is called quark matter. The possibility of having such new phase of matter in compact stars are discussed by A.R. Bodmer, Phys. Rev. **4**, 1601 (1971); E. Witten, Phys. Rev. D **30**, 272 (1984).

11. R.L. Jaffe and E. Farhi, Phys. Rev. D **30**, 2379 (1984).

12. C. Alcock, E. Farhi and A. Olinto, Astrophys. J. **310**, 261 (1986); P. Haensel, J.L. Zdunik and R. Schaeffer, Astron. Astrophys. **160**, 121 (1986); N.K. Glendenning and F. Weber, Astrophys. J. **400**, 647 (1992).

13. Glitches refer to the sudden spin-up of pulsars. Generally, the new rotation curve will relax back to the original spin-down curve. Such process is called postglitch relaxation. The physical mechanism of the postglitch relaxation is discussed by D. Pines and M.A. Alpar, Nature (London) **316**, 27 (1985).

14. G. Baym, in *Neutron Stars: Theory and Observation*, eds. J. Ventura and D. Pines, 21 (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1991).

15. K.S. Cheng and Z.G. Dai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1210 (1996).

16. N.K. Glendenning, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **B24**, 110 (1991); N.K. Glendenning, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 1274 (1992); H. Heiselberg, C.J. Pethick and E.F. Staubo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1355 (1993); V.R. Pandharipande and E.F. Staubo, in *Proc. 2nd International Conf. of Physics and Astrophysics of Aurk-Qluon Plasma* eds. B. Sinha, Y.P. Viyogi and S. Raha, (World Scientific, 1994).

17. M. Prakash, J.R. Cooke and J.M. Lattimer, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 661 (1995).

18. R.R. Caldwell and J.L. Friedman, Phys. Lett. B **264**, 143 (1991);W.Kluzniak, Astron. Astrophys. **286**, L17 (1994).

19. K.S. Cheng and Z.G. Dai, Astrophys. J. **476**, L39 (1997).

20. G. Baym and D. Pines, Ann. Phys. **66**, 816 (1971).

21. L. Spitzer, *Physics of Fully Ionized Gases*, 42 (2d ed.; New York: Interscience, 1962).

22. G. Baym, E.W. Kolb, L. McLerran, T.P. Walker and J.L. Jaffe, Phys. Lett. B **160**, 181 (1985).

23. P. Mészáros and M. Rees, Astrophys. J. **397**, 570 (1992).

24. A. Shemi and T. Piran, Astrophys. J. **365**, L55 (1990).

25. P. Mészáros and M. Rees, Astrophys. J. **405**, 278 (1993).

26. R. Blandford and D. Eichler, Phys. Rep. **154**, 1 (1987).

27. K.S. Cheng and D.M. Wei, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **283**, L133 (1996).

28. M.S. Strickman *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **464**, L131 (1996).

29. P. Mészáros, *High Energy Radiation from Magnetized Neutron Stars* (Univ. Chicago Press, 1992).

30. E. Waxman, Astrophys. J., in press (1997); Nature (London), submitted (1997).

31. M.J. Stark, A. Baykai, T. Strohmayer and J. J.H. Swank, Astrophys. J. **470**, L109 (1996).

32. K.Jahoda, M.J. Stark, T.E. Strohmayer and W.Zhang, in the Proceedings of the Symposium "The Active X-ray Sky",Rome, astro-ph/9712340(1997).

33. K.S.Cheng, Z.G.Dai, and T.Lu, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D., in press(1998).

34. K.S.Cheng and Z.G.Dai, Phys. Rev. Lett., **80**,18 (1998).